THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII. MARCH, 1928. No. 3.

The Blessing of the Work of Christ.

(Translated from Dr. Ed. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part I, chap. 2.)

The REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

When the Scriptures say that Christ redeemed us, it means the freeing from sin and all its consequences, but chiefly the freeing from *guilt*. Heb. 9, 14; Eph. 1, 7; Col. 1, 14; Rom. 3, 24. This redemption is described as a *purchase*. Rev. 5, 9 the four and twenty elders sing: "Thou hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation." The purchase-money is "not corruptible silver or gold, but the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot," 1 Pet. 1, 18. 19; in fact, His entire obedience, 1 Tim. 2, 6. This ransom was paid to God, not to the devil. Eph. 5, 2; Heb. 9, 14.

At the same time Christ appeased the wrath of God. St. Paul says that God set Him forth to be a propitiation in His blood. Rom. 3, 25. "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2, 2. The Greek verb which is the root of "propitiation" and "reconciliation" means "to appease wrath," "to dispose to grace or favor." The heathen used it of their gods; the Seventy [Septuagint], of God. Ps. 78, 38. It is peculiar that the Holy Scriptures in this connection do not make God the object of the verb (ἱλάσκομαι), but rather sin, respecting which the wrath of God is appeased. Thus it is said of Christ, Heb. 2, 17, that He became a faithful High Priest before God "to make reconciliation for the sins of the people"; according to the original Greek, "to propitiate" (*i. e.*, to expiate) "the sins of the people." Col. 1, 20 says the same, although in other words: "He made peace through the blood of His cross, by Himself." In the first place, He made peace on the one hand, by making satisfaction to the wrath of the Father. In this manner the love of the Son had to force its way by means of His blood through the anger of the divine majesty. But we are saved from wrath. Rom. 5, 8. 9.

Out of the wrath of God flow God's punishments, as out of a fountain. Now, if the Lord stopped up the fountainhead, then the stream will not drown us. For He "redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us." Gal. 3, 13. Thus He fulfilled what He had promised through the prophet Hosea: "I will redeem them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plague; O grave, I will be thy destruction." Hosea 13, 14. For the redeemed of God do not see death in all eternity. John 8, 51.

So, then, we are reconciled, 2 Cor. 5, 18; however, not only we, but also Hindus, and Hottentots and Kafirs, yes, the world. 2 Cor. 5, 19. "Reconciled," says our translation; the Greek original says: "placed in the right relation to God." Because before the Fall we, together with the whole creation, were in the right relation to God, therefore Scripture teaches that Christ, through His death, restored all things to the former right relation to God.

We, then, are redeemed from the guilt of sin; the wrath of God is appeased; all creation is again under the bright rays of Mercy, as in the beginning; yea, in Christ we were justified before we were even born. For do not the Scriptures say: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them"? 2 Cor. 5, 19. This is not the justification which we receive by faith, but the one which took place before all faith. — And Rom. 5, 18: "As by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." That is the great absolution which took place in the resurrection of Christ. For as the Father, for our sake, condemned His dear Son as the greatest of all sinners by causing Him to suffer the punishment of the transgressors, even so did He publicly absolve Him from the sins of the world when He raised Him up from the dead. And us in Him. Therefore Scripture says that Christ "was raised again *for our justification.*" Rom. 4, 25. And 1 Cor. 15, 17 declares that, if Christ be not raised up, then we are yet in our sins, we are not yet absolved. That is why the apostle wishes to be found in Christ and to know Him and the power of His resurrection, this victorious power, which takes away all sins as the sun dispels the fog. Phil. 3, 9. 10. That is why St. Peter says that our regeneration is effected through the resurrection of Christ, 1 Pet. 1, 3, that Baptism itself derives its saving power from it. 1 Pet. 3, 21. And lastly, that is why St. Paul declares: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in

thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Rom. 10, 9.

This is the work of Christ and its blessing. We have such an High Priest, "who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens," Heb. 7, 26; "who by His own blood entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. 9, 12. "For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10, 14.

Modern Religious Pedagogy and the Lutheran Principle of Worship.

P. E. KRETZMANN, St. Louis, Mo.

The social theology of the present time is both insidious and vicious. Having its origin in the subjectivism of Schleiermacher and in the present-worldliness of Ritschl, it has pretty thoroughly permeated the world of religious thought in our days. The religion of feeling has found a great many advocates, and the so-called worship program in the Sunday-school and in other institutions of a similar kind has found some strong advocates in many religious educators. It is time that we analyze the situation very carefully in order that we may realize along just what lines the danger is approaching and how we may best meet the present difficulties.

The theologians of Modernism and with them most of the modern religious educators have a conception of religion which is largely based upon evolutionistic ideas. Galloway, in his *Philosophy of Religion,* has the following to say: "In every form of religion man seeks to establish a helpful relationship between himself and higher powers. The impulse to form this relationship and to secure satisfaction through it proceeded from a felt need; and this need must have been latent in human nature, only requiring stimuli from the environment to quicken it to utterance." (p. 57.) There is still some possibility of constructing the thoughts of this sentence in harmony with the revealed truth. The same may be said of the definition given by Wilm, in his book *The Problem of Religion,* in which he states: "I should define religion as an emotion based upon a conviction that events are being overruled in view of a supreme and lasting good and an attitude of cooperation with the Power in the universe making for this good." (p. 29.) Both of these views are theistic, and Dr. Wilm is ready to define religion briefly as theistic optimism. Taking another discussion at random, namely,

Wright's book *A Student's Philosophy of Religion,* we find the following definition: "Religion is the endeavor to secure the conservation of socially recognized values through specific occasions that are believed to evoke some agency different from the ordinary *ego* of the individual or from other merely human beings, and that imply a feeling of dependence upon this agency." (p. 47.) Here we likewise have a definition which presupposes theism, while its form is evidently influenced by Hoeffding's discussions.

But a book which gives us the modern views of religion, and, to some extent, the modern views of worship, in a connected form, is *The Philosophy of Religion* by D. Miall Edwards, of the Congregational College at Brecon, Wales. After discussing the problem and scope of a philosophy of religion, the author presents his views on the origin of religion in the light of anthropology. Of the view which traces religion back to a special definite revelation he says that it is crudely unpsychological. His last sentence in this paragraph is: "The theory of evolution has led us to conceive of primitive man as utterly incapable of receiving and retaining the highly developed ideas which primitive revelation was supposed to connect to him." (p. 31f.) Being entirely under the influence of the theory of evolution, the writer then proceeds to show how religion and worship must have evolved. The animistic theory of E. B. Tylor, which attributes a kind of soul to the phenomena of nature, does not seem adequate to our author. The ghost-theory of Herbert Spencer, which finds the origin of religion in the worship of ancestors appearing in the form of ghosts, likewise seems inadequate to this student. For the same reason he dismisses totemism as the simplest and most primitive religion. He finally proposes the notion of the pre-animistic religion, with its conception of mana. According to this theory religion grew out of a sense of awe in the presence of a diffused, indefinable, mysterious power or powers not regarded as personal. According to this author and others who have followed a similar line of thought, religion then developed through animism, fetishism, totemism, polytheism, and monolatry to monotheism. According to the notion held by many men who adhere to these theories, every human being in some way lives through the same stages of this development or evolution, and therefore such development must be taken into account in any program of religious education.

Let us confine ourselves almost entirely to the notion of modern worship connected with this evolutionistic notion of re-

ligion. In a recent book by Vogt, entitled *Modern Worship,* he speaks first of all of religion as celebration. The essential nature and power of religious experience is said to be enjoyment. And connected with this enjoyment there is a feeling of awe as in the presence of an all-powerful being. To this author worship offers no fixed content of its own. The abiding form of a man's celebration is to be filled with the new content of his good thoughts and good deeds. All objective forms of worship are to be reduced to a minimum, so that Professor Buckham's three elements of worship are to be brought out, namely, the direct individual experience of truth, the culture of the soul by contemplation, and the dedication of self in love. Vogt would enlarge this program by including a total of seven elements in his pattern of worship: vision, humility, vitality, recollection, illumination, dedication, and peace. To these elements all liturgical forms are to be subjected. Every person is to be permitted to bring out his feeling for the Supreme Being in his own subjective way. It is not surprising that the author says: "From the point of view of spiritual continuity and wealth it would seem to be far more desirable for the followers of Mahatma Gandhi to remain inside the ancient frame of the Hindu faiths than to come into formal fellowship with Christianity. . . . For my own part I should prefer to enter a church enriched by certain symbols of Christianity and containing also symbolic reminders of other faiths to entering a building barren of historic acknowledgment of any kind. . . . In parish churches with sufficient strength to erect buildings of large scale there is opportunity for a chapel of all faiths." (p. 144f.) This is the logical result of the theory of evolution as applied to religion and to worship.

But this idea is not only contained in theoretical discussions of the idea of worship. It is found in books which deal directly with the practical side of religious education. In a recent book by Edna Dean Baker, entitled *The Worship of the Little Child,* we have a typical discussion of modern views of worship growing out of a naturalistic conception of religion. The basic thought of the book is evident: Man is a religious animal. On one of the first pages of the book we have the following paragraph: "The impulse to worship is native, not acquired. The prehistoric savage kneels before the mighty oak and offers it homage. The Indian seeks a lonely mountain and, silent, immovable, watching the panorama of sunrise and sunset, of light and darkness, worships the Great Mystery. The shepherds on the hills of Judea see a strong light

and hear the songs of an angelic choir; seeking the stable in Bethlehem, they find there a Babe and, falling down upon their knees, they worship Him. The little child stops spell-bound with the wonder of a robin's song or a cricket's chirp and spontaneously adores the Wonder-maker." (p. 14.)

This wonder of the untaught savage and of the little child is supposed to lead him and it to worship. For if upon investigation the mysterious aspect of the object or the phenomena remain, or if upon first presentation that aspect is strange, the child is filled with a feeling that men call wonder. It is only a step, so the author says, from wonder to worship; for the answer to the riddle of life is God.

It is on the basis of this feeling that the author intends to build up a program of worship. And it is in keeping with the theories of religion and with the notion of worship as an expression of awe and wonder that modern religious educators want to build up a program of worship without considering the demands of the Word of God. For this reason we find in a book entitled *The Kingdom of Love,* by Blanche Carrier, the following study of worship: "Why do we love God? . . . God is great and powerful. God loves and cares for us. God is all-wise and perfect. . . . How do we feel about such a God? What does it make us want to do? We bow in wonder and awe before Him. We love Him very deeply. We look up to Him. . . . When we talk to God, what will we pray about? We thank Him for His power, care, and gifts. We ask for His care. We ask for strength and wisdom to know and to do the right. . . . When we feel this wonder and love, when we need to know what is right, when we sit and think quietly about God or talk with Him, it is called worship." (p. 152.)

It is on this account, with this notion of religion and worship in mind, that all modern books for classes in religion contain special sections entitled "Worship Service." A part of the lesson hour is devoted to having the children think about God and His attributes. Thus the responses of the children are directed into little forms of grateful expressions, as, for example: "Thank you, God, for the flowers. I thank you, God, for the robin. Thank you, God, for the little new leaves. Thank you, God, for the sunshine. Thank you, God, for the green grass. Thank you for the pussy-willows. Thank you for the warm rain," etc. This is supposed to be the highest achievement in the worship program in school and Sunday-school.

To one who is not imbued with evolutionism and with modern

naturalistic pedagogy the mistake is clear from the outset. We know that natural religion is the remnant of the original knowledge of God left in the heart of man after the Fall, by which he acknowledges the existence of a Supreme Being, stands in awe of Him, and enters into the relation of worship to Him. But this religion is not to find its development in its own way. The Bible states that men, on the basis of this last remnant of the knowledge of God, are to seek after God, if haply they might find Him as He has revealed Himself in the Word of Truth. No child in any school or Sunday-school may simply be asked to give expression to its natural feeling of awe and wonder in the presence of the supernatural. The Lord tells the woman of Samaria, in John 4: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Only those can truly worship God who have entered into spiritual fellowship with Him. And there is only one way of establishing this fellowship, namely, that made possible through the atoning work of Jesus Christ. It is only through Him that men truly have access to the Father. For that reason every program of worship and every worship service must be based upon the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ. When we speak to little children of God the Creator, God the Father, God in His various attributes, we must do so for the purpose of having them realize the full scope of the fatherhood of God in Christ. They must learn at once to approach the heavenly Father in and through the Redeemer. They must know the significance of the formula "through Jesus Christ." The naturalistic pedagogy, expressed in its form of worship, will preserve and develop the idea of a work religion. But true worship is a reflection of, and a reaction to, the Spirit of God revealed in Holy Scriptures. The sacramental part of worship must ever precede the sacrificial. The worship of a Christian must be based upon knowledge, not upon feeling. While we do not insist upon specific forms of prayers, especially when a Christian is speaking directly to his heavenly Father, we always keep in mind the background of the worship taught in Scriptures. For that reason the prayers which are taught our Lutheran children from Luther's Small Catechism and from the writings of other men who had the spirit of prayer in unusual measure make for a sound pedagogy, and we ought by all means to abide by the forms which have been transmitted to us by the teachers of our Church and shun all modern ideas which are based upon evolution and a false conception of religion.

Studies in First Peter.

I. Did the Apostle Peter Write This Epistle?

Students of the modern critical literature on First Peter will soon notice that the chief isagogical question with which the critics occupy themselves is that of the *authorship* of this book. It overshadows even the famous problem as to the meaning of Babylon in 1 Pet. 5, 13. Negative critics either reject the Petrine authorship outright or declare it doubtful, some regarding the epistle as the product of somebody who hid behind the name of the great apostle (pseudepigraphic theory), while others think that it originally was an anonymous composition and later on was provided with the introductory sentence claiming Petrine authorship for it and with the respective personal remarks in the conclusion which presuppose that St. Peter is the writer. To mention a few American scholars, Professor Bacon, of Yale, inclines to the view that First Peter "*may* [italics ours. *A.*] represent to us the adoptive work of Peter, writing 'by Silvanus.'" (*New Testament Introduction,* p. 157.) Similar are the words of Professor Fowler, of Brown University. (*History and Literature of the New Testament,* p. 266.) Prof. E. F. Scott, of Union Seminary, says: "That Peter himself wrote the book is more than doubtful." (*First Age of Christianity,* p. 170.) Nobody who believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures and holds that First Peter is an integral part of the Canon can entertain such views, the statement of the book itself as to its Petrine origin being so unambiguous and direct. "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ"; in these words, put according to the custom of the ancients at the beginning of the letter, the writer discloses his identity (1, 1). An examination of all critical and introductory material that has accumulated through the centuries will be seen not to contradict this testimony of the letter itself, but rather serve to strengthen our faith in the divine character of the New Testament.

If we scan the epistle itself for further proof of St. Peter's authorship, we shall not be disappointed. The writer speaks of himself as a witness of the sufferings of Christ (5, 1), which points unmistakably to his belonging to the circle of the apostles. The words 2, 23 ("who, when He was reviled, reviled not again," etc.) show that the writer had intimate knowledge of the attitude of Jesus toward His enemies when He was in their power. The mention of Mark as the son of Peter (5, 13) is in keeping with what we know of early church history, since Acts 12, 12 ff. indicates that

there was a bond of close fellowship between St. Peter and the family to which Mark belonged. The general contents of the letter offer striking confirmation of the Petrine authorship. Several speeches of Peter are reported to us in the Book of Acts, and it will be seen that what is stressed there, the ill treatment of Christ, His death and resurrection, the salvation He achieved, are points which are prominent in this epistle. Farrar remarks that even as to style this epistle of the apostle and his recorded speeches resemble each other in many particulars; and he adds: "The letter is characterized by the fire and energy which we should expect to find in his forms of expression; but that energy is tempered by the tone of apostolic dignity and by the fatherly mildness of one who was now aged and was near the close of a life of labor." (*Early Days of Christianity,* p. 81.) It is worthy of note that the letter does not mention personal acquaintances among the readers, which again harmonizes with such information as we possess on Peter's activities; for there is no evidence that he ever visited the provinces named 1, 2 and became personally acquainted with the Christians of Asia Minor. Neither should it be overlooked that the silence of the apostle with respect to the Ceremonial Law of the Jews and the utter absence of prejudice against Gentile Christians and those who had evangelized them, fully agrees with the generous support of the work among the Gentiles, which is so conspicuous a characteristic of Peter's conduct as depicted in Acts.

Turning now to the external evidence for the authenticity of the letter, we find that it could not be of an earlier date and hardly any stronger than is actually the case. The most ancient and the strongest witness is Second Peter, which in 3, 1 ("This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you") unmistakably testifies to the Petrine authorship of our letter. Of the apostolic fathers, Papias, Polycarp, and, quite probably, Clement of Rome used this epistle. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Cyprian make express mention of it. That the *Canon Muratori* does not contain its name may be due to the fragmentary state in which we possess this document, it having been quite plausibly conjectured that the lost beginning of the catalog referred to it as well as to several other New Testament books not mentioned in the present form of the document. Origen and Eusebius placed the letter among the universally accepted books, the so-called homologumena. The testimony of the early Church regarding the authenticity of our letter is so overwhelming that even Renan was constrained to write: "The first epistle [of Peter] is one of the

writings of the New Testament which are the most anciently and the most unanimously cited as authentic." (Quoted by Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 80.)

Why, then, in the face of so much clear, decisive evidence, that hesitancy or absolute unwillingness of so many critics to accept First Peter as genuine? Their considerations are, of course, of a rationalistic nature. It is worth while to note that the last hundred years, so rich in discoveries and new hypotheses, did not produce new arguments against the Petrine origin of our letter. What De Wette, who was in doubt as to its author, pointed to a century ago is still urged, and hardly anything besides. What he regarded as difficulties were the kind of persecution which seems to be presupposed in the letter, the apparent dependence of the letter on other New Testament books, and its indefiniteness as to the circle of readers addressed (*"Der Brief hat eine zu unbestimmte Beziehung, als dass man glauben sollte, Petrus haette dafuer die Feder ergriffen"*). The last point, I find, has largely been abandoned by modern criticism, its untenable nature being too patent. In place of it the language and style are stressed as being un-Petrine.

That the letter speaks of persecutions, trials, and sufferings is, of course, undeniable. Some say the statements of the epistle on this subject make it necessary to assume that it was written at the time of the bloody Neronian persecution. But in that persecution Peter was martyred; how could he at the same time write a letter comforting the Christians suffering the persecution? That is their difficulty. Others maintain that the nature of the persecution alluded to in the letter is such as to make it imperative to place its composition in the reign of Trajan, which, of course, means that St. Peter did not write it. Even the defenders of the authenticity of the letter are not agreed as to the kind of persecution contemplated here. Zahn looks upon it as being devoid of an official character, while Ramsay and others hold that "the figure of the Roman magistrate cannot be removed from 1 Pet. 4." I believe that Zahn's view, who places the date of the letter before 64 A. D., the year when the Neronian persecution broke upon the church in Rome, is right. The government is not pictured as the enemy of the Christians. The sufferings enumerated are of a general nature, such as came, for example, upon St. Paul and his associates during his missionary journeys related in Acts, sufferings due not to a hostile policy of the central government at Rome, but to the enmity which the Gospel encountered so universally. The terms

used bear this out — "speaking evil," "reproach," "railing," etc. It is true that the apostle speaks of a "fiery trial." But that does not necessarily imply a persecution at the hands of the government. It may well describe the lot of the Christians, who in those days were termed a sect which was "everywhere spoken against," Acts 28, 22. The expression "to suffer as a Christian," 4, 16, is by some regarded as indicative of systematic persecution by the imperial authorities. But is it? We can well imagine that A. D. 62 to 64 there were many communities in Asia Minor and elsewhere in which an open profession of faith in Jesus Christ made a person a marked man, just as in many cities of China to-day British citizenship will give one both an unenviable and a dangerous prominence, frequently entailing abuse and cruel treatment. Besides, we must not overlook that the Neronian persecution, as the records seem to indicate, was confined to Rome and that it was not, in the first place, caused by religious prejudice, but by the desire of Nero to find a scapegoat on which might be placed the responsibility for the conflagration that had so largely destroyed the imperial city. There is no early witness to the effect that this persecution extended to the provinces. Hence the assumption that the epistle was written between 64 and 67, after the storm had begun to sweep over the church in Rome, would not be of much avail in explaining the persecutions which, according to our letter, took place, or were to be expected, in the various parts of Asia Minor. But as pointed out above, no such hypothesis is needed, since the status of the Christians is not described in a way to imply that their religion had become a forbidden one in the Roman Empire. That Peter should have written this letter, say, about 62 or 63, is not unlikely. My view of the situation is this: Paul's imprisonment in Rome, lasting two years (Acts 28, 30), had ended with his liberation; he had left the city and gone to Spain. Peter had come to Rome, and a journey which Silas (Silvanus) contemplated making through the chief provinces of Asia Minor gave him an opportunity to address an encouraging letter to the Christians living in those regions. This hypothesis seems to me not to contradict any of the few hints which have been preserved to us as to the later activities of the two great apostles.

When urging that First Peter is dependent on other New Testament books, the critics say that an apostle like Peter would not have stooped to use the material of some other writer, and that, besides, such dependence makes it necessary to regard our epistle as a late book, originating at a time when St. Peter had

been dead a number of years. The whole argument rests more or less on a *petitio principii,* on an unproved assumption, namely, the theory that in First Peter we find embodied material taken from New Testament books of an earlier date, the books in question being chiefly the Pauline epistles. Even conservative scholars have fallen a prey to this view. For example, Maurice Jones, a defender of the authenticity of our letter, says: "The influence of the Pauline writings upon our epistle is unmistakable and is universally acknowledged. The connection is most intimate in the case of the Epistle to the Romans, and here the resemblance is so marked and so continuous that it cannot possibly be accidental. The same thoughts, the same rare words, appear in both epistles, and in one passage (Rom. 13, 1—7 = 1 Pet. 2, 13—17) the same ideas occur in exactly the same order. There is also a close affinity between our epistle and Ephesians, but this is manifested not so much in the region of language, but rather in identities of thought and in the very remarkable similarity of structure." (*The New Testament in the Twentieth Century,* p. 335.) Dr. Jones's explanation is that Peter, during his stay in Rome, made a close study of Romans and Ephesians and, when writing an epistle of his own, "would not disdain to employ the thoughts and conceptions of his fellow-apostle with which he was now so familiar." But all this assumes that Peter could not have uttered the same thoughts and used the same phrases as Paul without study of the Pauline letters — an assumption which is far from justified. In the eyes of these critics similarity seems to presuppose and imply genetic relationship. If one apostle speaks and writes like the other, it must be due to this, that one borrowed from the other. That both belonged to the circle of early believers in Jesus Christ; that the same Holy Spirit lived in them and actuated them in their activities; that there were conferences between them in which their message was discussed; that by and by a number of phrases were coined which got to be the common property of the Christians; that, the needs of the readers of the apostolic letters being similar, the exhortations, etc., had to be similar; that our epistle possesses strongly marked individual traits and contains several thoughts that are peculiar to it, — all this is largely overlooked. McNeile (*New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's,* p. 137) says very well: "It is important to remember that an agreement with St. Paul does not necessarily imply a borrowing from him. In describing his own movements, St. Paul says that when he went to Jerusalem, he put before 'them of repute' the Gospel which

he preached among the Gentiles, and they 'added nothing' to him. Gal. 2, 1f. 6. All that was essential in his evangelistic preaching and theirs was practically the same. The background of all the apostolic doctrine and literature was the Old Testament with its age-long traditions of a sacred people, chosen of old by God, and its expectations of an ideal age to come; then the primary facts of Christ's death, resurrection, exaltation, and the gift of His Spirit to the members of the Christian fellowship; and finally the expectation of the near approach of the end. It is not surprising that there was much on which the two apostles expressed themselves similarly." When McNeile, in his next sentence, grants, after all, that Peter was indebted to Romans and Ephesians, he is, in my opinion, making an admission which is entirely gratuitous.

There remains the objection based on the style and language of the epistle. Peter, the Galilean fisherman, it is argued, could not have written such good and often beautiful Greek as is found in this letter. How do we know? is my reply. To what extent Peter was linguistically and esthetically gifted can be gathered only from the New Testament. Why not accept its indirect testimony, found in the speeches and letters of Peter? If, in the absence of further information, one wishes to rely on general principles and says that a man so poor and so far down in the social scale could not have possessed the degree of culture which is exhibited in this letter, one simply contradicts human experience, which tells us that some of our most highly prized literary productions have come from men who belonged to the lower strata of society, for instance, the prophecies of Amos, to mention an inspired writing, and *Pilgrim's Progress*. A friend reminded me of the striking case of Abraham Lincoln. It is a serious error, disproved abundantly by modern research, to think that no Greek was spoken in Galilee in the first century A. D., or that none but a few literati could read or write in those days. Opposing such a view, Maurice Jones says (*op. cit.*, p. 337): "The knowledge that we have acquired by means of the recently discovered papyri shows that it is by no means inconceivable that a native of Galilee should possess a good working knowledge of the Greek language, and more than this the epistle does not imply." Besides, we must not forget that Peter, like his fellow-apostles, was filled with the Holy Spirit and had been endowed with special and extraordinary gifts. It will probably be objected that, according to a very early and exceedingly trustworthy tradition (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 39), Peter made use of Mark as interpreter, which would

seem to imply that he was not able to preach in any language except his native Aramaic. But this inference is far too broad since the term "interpreter" need not signify any more than this, that Mark committed to writing the Gospel-message preached by Peter, just as Xenophon and Plato might be called the interpreters of Socrates.

It will be seen, then, that the objections urged against the Petrine authorship of our book need not perturb us because they rest on hypotheses which can well be shown to be far-fetched or untenable. In spite of its efforts, negative criticism cannot remove from the list of apostolic works this letter, concerning which McNeile says (*op. cit.*, p. 138): "The utter sincerity and simple beauty of his [Peter's] writing make it of unique value and attractiveness. To compare First Peter with the Pauline epistles is like comparing Schubert with Beethoven."

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Retirement of Dr. Sandt. — The *Lutheran* lost an able editor in the person of Dr. George W. Sandt, who after thirty-one years of service, on December 31, 1927, relinquished his position at the head of the *Lutheran*. Dr. Sandt will continue to be in charge of the department of "Daily Devotions." The other editorial work hitherto done by him will fall on the shoulders of the man who of late was associated with him in the editorship of the *Lutheran*, Dr. N. R. Mehlhorn. Now and then we could not sanction Dr. Sandt's views, but we gladly admit that, generally speaking, he was a champion of conservative Lutheranism and that his eloquent editorials breathed a truly evangelical spirit. Dr. Sandt was born in 1854. He was graduated from the Philadelphia Theological Seminary in 1883. From 1884 to 1889 he was an instructor at Augustana College. From 1889 to 1896 he served as pastor. In the last-named year his connection with the *Lutheran* began, and it continued uninterruptedly to the present time.

"The Divine Call. — The pastors of the Mankato Circuit, assembled in conference at St. James, Minn., November 21—22, 1927, having 'The Divine Call' under consideration, deplore the lax practises altogether too common in our Church, both on the part of pastors and congregations as regards the call. We believe that it is not God's will that a pastor should *seek* a call or *offer* himself for such a call, but he should wait until the Master calls him. We believe that this matter of call needs to be considered carefully and *prayerfully* by both pastors and congregations and that nothing should be done by either pastors or congregations that may tend to lower the estimate of the call in the sight of the Christian people. Unanimously

adopted by the Conference. (Signed.) S. O. Simundson, president. C. K. Malmin, secretary." — We clip this from the *Lutheran Church Herald* of December 6, 1927, organ of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, and pass it on to all whom it may concern. E.

"How Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism." — That is the heading of an article in the *Religious Press Digest,* December, 1927, which article summarizes an article in the *Christian Century* by Miles H. Krumbine, the Lutheran minister of the U. L. C. who permitted Fosdick to occupy his pulpit some time ago. The friend of Fosdick says: "The one question that I am asked more frequently than any other by my non-Lutheran friends goes something like this: 'How, in the light of Luther's great freedom of spirit, can you explain the ultraconservatism of the American Lutheran Church of to-day?'" If Fosdick should propound this vexing question at his next visit with Dr. Krumbine, he would get some information. "Frankly, until I read Dr. Vergilius Ferm's *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology,* I could not explain it. The mental daring, the catholicity of spirit, the marked spontaneity and frank avowal of personal conviction of Luther — especially the Luther of those great days before 1525 — always seemed utterly unlike anything I ever knew or experienced in the Lutheran Church of my time. This book makes it plain enough. It is really a sad story." The article then goes on to retell the story of the "Definite Synodical Platform" — how the work of S. S. Schmucker, "the greatest figure since Muhlenberg," came to naught; how "his own son, his brother-in-law, and Dr. C. P. Krauth, one of his students and an intimate friend, became protagonists of the confessional point of view." And Fosdick will say: "It is really a sad story." The article adds: "The old General Synod continued on its way, nourishing a liberal spirit, at least among a minority of its leaders. In 1918 these three bodies joined in what is now the United Lutheran Church of America." And we say: It is really a sad story. The article, as condensed, concludes thus: "It is not unfair to say that in that union there is left little, if any, trace of American Lutheranism as it was, for the trend in the United Lutheran Church is certainly toward an increasing confessionalism." And Fosdick will tell Dr. Krumbine: That is really a sad state of affairs, while we tell him: It is a heartening report. — We do not know whether the original article carried the heading: How Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism. But if it has been fairly condensed by the *Digest,* the heading is most appropriate; for it expresses Dr. Krumbine's sentiments exactly. E.

The "Sunday-School Times" Opposes Unionism. — Under the caption "Fellowship in a Ministerial Association" the *Sunday-school Times* of December 24, 1927, writes as follows: —

"Friendliness and genuine Christian love toward an individual, whether he is sound or unsound in the faith or a Buddhist or a confessed atheist, is the privilege and duty of all true Christians. But membership or fellowship in a professedly Christian group that includes professing Christians who deny the claims of Christ and the

authority of the Scriptures is forbidden to God's people by his Word. The beloved apostle, who wrote by inspiration on the duty and privilege of Christian love in a way that lays upon every believer such requirements of love as only God can enable us to meet (1 John 4), wrote also this plain and uncompromising command from the Holy Spirit: 'Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed; for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds.' 2 John 9—11.

"To join a ministerial association that includes in its membership Unitarians, who deny the unique and eternal deity of Christ, is to ignore and disobey this injunction of the Scriptures. To have organized or official fellowship in any group or in a formal reception of professing Christians, whether ministers or laymen, who deny 'the doctrine of Christ' with all that this includes, is to bid such persons Godspeed, which God's Word forbids us to do. There can be no gain, but only loss, in showing a 'friendliness' toward men which means disloyalty to our Lord. Our truest friendliness toward those who have turned aside from truth and blessing is to show forth real love for them and seek to bring them into the truth, in ways that shall not condone their error or weaken our witness to our Lord."

This is sound Scripture doctrine. But now let us say to the editor of the *Sunday-school Times* and his associates: *Fiat applicatio!* According to their own declaration they have to cease belonging to lodges, since the lodge religion denies Christ. They have to cease fraternizing with people who in one or more doctrines prove disloyal to the Word of God. May God give them strength and willingness to follow the principles so clearly enunciated in the above!

Good Apologetic Material. — The *Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1927, contains two apologetic articles of more than passing interest. One is an exhaustive discussion of the narrative of the annunciation of the birth of Christ given by St. Luke. The writer, Dr. Machen, contends for the integrity of this narrative, showing that the theory of interpolation according to which the reference to the supernatural birth of Jesus did not originally belong to the story is from every point of view untenable. The writer proves his thesis in masterly fashion. The other article has the caption, "The Sign of the Prophet Jonah and Its Modern Confirmations." The writer rebukes the unbelieving critics who ridicule the story of "Jonah and the Whale," and shows that there are several cases on record where men were swallowed by a whale and were ejected alive. A point which one will do well to remember is that according to the writer (A. J. Wilson of Oxford) the sperm whale, or cachalot, "subsists for the most part on the octopus, bodies of which, far larger than the body of a man, have been found whole in its stomach." It seems, then, that the critics, when they discredit the story of Jonah, are building their arguments on assumptions which are unwarranted by the facts.

The Bible Itself Is the Real Issue. — Under the caption "Is the Bible Trustworthy?" the *Watchman-Examiner* (Baptist) of November 24, 1927, has the following editorial, which we are reprinting in full: —

"In our office we had a conversation with an eminent Baptist minister about the Bible. He said frankly: 'Of course, the Bible teaches the virgin birth of Christ, the bodily resurrection of Christ, the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and the visible bodily return of Christ, but in all honesty I must say that I do not believe in any of these things.'

"Those who reject the teachings mentioned in the foregoing paragraph fall into two general classes. The first class acclaims its belief in the trustworthiness of the Bible and then by every art known to man seeks to prove that the Bible, rightly interpreted, does not teach such doctrines. The second class frankly admits that the Bible does teach such doctrines, but just as frankly it declares that for good and sufficient reasons it cannot accept these doctrines. We have more respect for the man who says that Christ and the apostles were mistaken than for the man who, because he is too timid to take that position, juggles with the Bible and tries to make it teach what the wayfaring man, though a fool, knows that it does not teach. There are vast differences among us as to the trustworthiness of the Bible and the authority of the teachings of Christ and the apostles. We can make no progress toward the solution of our theological problems until we are candid enough to state these problems.

"For instance, is there any known method of interpretation that can create the slightest doubt as to what the Bible teaches as to the Virgin Birth, the resurrection of Christ, the vicarious atonement, and the second coming of our Lord? We are trying to emphasize the fact that these doctrines are too plainly taught to be argued away by any honest method of interpretation. Not to accept them is to question either the trustworthiness of the Bible record or the authority of the teachings of Christ and His apostles.

"It is intellectually dishonest to juggle with the unmistakable teachings of the Bible. The great doctrines of Christianity come not from Calvin or Augustine, but from the Holy Bible. It is not the theology of the Middle Ages over which the battle rages, it is the theology of the New Testament. Only two questions are involved, 'Were Christ and His apostles authoritative teachers?' and 'Is the New Testament the record of those teachings?'"

The editorial remarks of the *Watchman-Examiner* point out the real issue in doctrinal controversies. Whether or not a man accepts and confesses the truth will depend upon his attitude towards the Bible: Does he believe that the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God, or does he not believe it? — It is noteworthy in this connection to read (see first paragraph of editorial) that "an eminent Baptist minister" can frankly deny the fundamental truths of the Christian religion and still be counted a Baptist minister. It is one of the sad signs of the times in which we are living. FRITZ.

Strange Ideas of the Kingdom of God Persisting. — We were in hopes that the strange notions advocated by the late Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, of Rochester Seminary, would soon die a natural death, since they were so utterly out of harmony with clear Scriptural teaching. But it seems that the spirit of Schleiermacher and Ritschl is strong enough to stand up under a good deal of common-sense criticism, being supported also by recent books, such as *The Economics of the Kingdom of God,* by Paul B. Bull, *The Return of Christendom,* by a group of churchmen, *Ownership,* by Clementina Butler, *Christ and Money,* by Hugh A. Martin, and others. One of the latest articles along this line appeared in the *Living Church,* of Milwaukee, a few months ago. To the author of this article the definition by Father Bull is altogether acceptable when he says that "the kingdom of God may be defined as the organization of human society in obedience to the will of God and for the fulfilment of His purpose." And again: "The kingdom of God, a collection of representative Christian utterances on what its realization would mean, and a selection of attempts which are being made or suggested to move toward its realization and practise." With this ideal in mind, the author deplores the Church's strange persistence in working for the salvation and spiritual cultivation of the individual, whereas, so the author states, her duty is alike to the individual and to society. — It would pay all these people who are dabbling in Christian Sociology to make a thorough study of the ideals of Christ and, above all, of His purpose, when He states that He came into the world to seek and to save that which was lost and to that end to lay down His life for many.

K.

Growth in Doctrine Is Not Change of Doctrine — a Confounding of Terms. — What the Rev. Mr. Jones, pastor of Richmond Hill Congregational Church, Bournemouth, England, in an article entitled "The Perils of Routine," printed in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* of December 22, 1927, advocates does not surprise us; for what he says is quite in line with the policy of his own church-body, the Congregational Church. Nor are we in these days much surprised that a Methodist church-paper reprints approvingly the remarks of Mr. Jones. We quote as follows [italics our own]: —

"'I believe in the Holy Ghost.' We can all heartily say that, but we do not all accept what that faith involves. For to believe in the Holy Ghost is to believe in growth in our perception of Christian truth; for the Spirit is constantly taking of the things of Christ and revealing them to men. That this is so is abundantly clear to any one who studies the history of the Christian Church. Men have grown in their understanding of Christ's mind. *And the growing understanding of Christ's mind has necessitated changes in the statement of Christian truth.* That such changes have taken place in the course of the Christian centuries is undeniable. Doctrines have again and again had to change their form because of the advances of knowledge. *The heterodoxies of one day have become the orthodoxies of the next.* . . . Once again the Church finds itself in a time of vast and far-reaching change. New discoveries have necessitated new

statements of our faith. *Our views of the Bible, our ideas as to God's relationship to the world have got to be reconstructed.* There are some who make the old protest of custom and tradition. 'Not so . . . for we have never.' I wish to say that if the Church as a whole adopts that attitude, she will inevitably lose all command of the rising generation. May God preserve us from narrowness and obscurantism of that kind! The Church that will not get out of its groove will find its grave. The Church's business in this world is to proclaim a Gospel — the great and wonderful Gospel of the grace of God in the redemption of mankind through the sacrifice of Christ. *It is not here to insist upon a certain cosmogony or a certain theory of inspiration.* It is here to proclaim the Gospel. And what I want to see, what I pray the Church may always be, is a Church that shall be ever loyal to that central Gospel, but which, because it believes in the Holy Ghost, will always be frank and open-eyed and hospitable to *new* truth. Such a Church, at once fervently evangelical and yet progressive and free, will, I believe, capture and hold the world."

Surely we should grow in doctrine. The Bible itself bids us do so. But this means that we should, by prayerful and careful study, better learn to know the revealed and written doctrines of the Bible. Growth in doctrine does not mean, or call for, a change of doctrine. This the Bible itself emphatically forbids. Gal. 1, 6—12; Rom. 16, 17. 18, *et al.* The Bible is the revealed Word of God, and God, being unchangeable, cannot change His Word, denying now what He at one time asserted. Truth never changes; it is its very nature that it cannot; otherwise it would not be truth. J. H. C. F.

Reasons for Unitarian Decreases. — Commenting on the losses which the Unitarians have sustained during the last decade, the *Presbyterian* writes editorially: "In 1916 there were in this country 416 Unitarian churches, while in the ten years following the number of these churches dropped from 416 to 344, a loss of nearly 75 individual congregations, at an hour when the loud call is being made inside Orthodoxy to copy our teaching from the books of liberal Christians. It is always a mystery why men make so earnest an argument for a creedless Church, when the picture of a fading Unitarianism is seen so clearly upon the screen. These 72 Unitarian churches must have causes for their extinction, and we stop to inquire what these causes are.

"First, we may be free to say that it is not because liberal Christianity is unpopular or impoverished. From those early days in New England the most cultured and intellectual and wealthy families were ranged on the side of this indefinite creed. The Unitarian position has made so little demand upon the credulous in men; indeed, they have always boasted of being the real Rationalists of America, kinsmen to those German Liberals who either denied or evaded the region of the supernatural. The decline of a sect like the Shakers is due to their unpopular repudiation of marriage and their communism, which severely limited their disciples. Unitarianism has had nothing like this to impede its progress. All that abounds in the most lavish environment is at the command of our leading liberal churches. We

must look elsewhere for our reasons to interpret this decline between 1916 and 1926.

"Is it not all explained in one simple phrase — the absence of authority? . . . If, indeed, there is no authority except those mercurial emotions of one's inner being, then, indeed, a Church is a questionable investment, financially as well as religiously, and it is hardly logical to labor for a cause that is uncertain, if not unreal. Is it not this absence of certainty and authority that has closed these churches? Humanity craves what the evangelical churches offer in Jesus Christ — a voice that stands from age to age, certain in the midst of uncertainty and infallible amidst the fallible."

Since the conservatives in the Presbyterian Church understand the essence and deadliness of Liberalism so well, we wonder why they refuse to do the only logical and Christian thing, namely, testify against Unitarianism in their midst by the most telling protest of separation. MUELLER.

Rome's Triumph in Bavaria. — Dr. H. Koch, of Berlin, has published an important essay in the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche,* in which he points out the dangers accruing to the state from the establishment of a concordat with Rome, and especially the almost abject submission of Bavaria to the wishes of the Pope in the concordat of 1924. The article is timely, since Rome is now seeking to arrange a concordat with Prussia and the rest of Germany. Bavaria has agreed not to appoint theological or philosophical professors against whom the Roman bishop raises an objection. Dr. Koch points out that while three-fifths of the population of Bavaria are Roman Catholics and two-fifths Protestants, the state assists the Catholic Church with sums of money three times as high as those given the Protestant Church. The state provides 82 Roman dignitaries with dwellings; but no Protestant dignitary is thus provided for from the public exchequer. In Bavaria, then, the baneful union of Church and State still continues, and Rome is decidedly the beneficiary.

Education in the Roman Catholic Church of the United States during the Past Year. — Reviewing education in his Church during the past year, Paul L. Blakely, S. J., writes, among other things, in *America* of December 31, 1927: —

"During the year, sixty-four new parish schools were opened. Adding the thirty-seven reported in the closing months of 1926, the total is 101 for the ninety-five dioceses in the United States, in a period of approximately fourteen months. Fourteen new high schools and one college, Regis College, at Newton, Mass., directed by the Sisters of St. Joseph, were founded.

"A glance at the estimates for 1927 will show that there are 2,488,461 young people in all our institutions, an increase over the 2,428,019 of 1926. In the elementary schools the increase is from 2,111,560 in 1926, to 2,187,576; in the secondary schools, from 204,815 to 215,000; in the colleges and universities, from 74,949 to 85,830. On the whole, a satisfactory growth is indicated. Much remains to be done, however, since approximately half of our young people are either not in any school or in non-Catholic schools.

"For 1926 more complete financial data are at hand, and I quote the items which probably remained unchanged in 1927. Reports from 113 colleges and universities estimated the total value of grounds, buildings, and equipment at $174,507,928. Thirty-nine of these institutions have a combined endowment of $17,402,217. Seventy-four either have no endowment or report none. The Catholic University has the largest endowment, $2,903,642. Creighton University, Omaha, follows with $2,317,488; Marquette University, Milwaukee, with $1,871,819; St. Louis University, St. Louis, with $1,500,000; and Notre Dame and Columbia College, Dubuque, with $1,000,000.

"As to the parish school, I speak with deference to those who hold a contrary opinion, but I am convinced that its status will never be assured until it is replaced by the diocesan school. I formed that opinion nearly ten years ago, and time has only strengthened it. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore decreed the founding of a school in every parish, and wisely, since forty years ago that was the best way of securing educational facilities for our people. Conditions to-day are not what they were in 1884. We have parishes amply able to maintain schools and others that cannot possibly have a school; and the rest exist simply because priests and Sisters are willing to win a martyr's crown. We need equalization, and that we cannot have as long as the parishes are mutually independent. We can secure it only by a diocesan control with teeth in it — a central power with authority over the training, placing, transfer, and removal of teachers; a power that can set standards and demand results or the reasons why not; and, finally, which can levy a tax to be expended not in this or that parish, but in this or that neighborhood, where a school is most needed. Parish lines are not intimately connected with the Deposit of the Faith. They are divisions sanctioned by the Church to get the work done better. They can be lifted (not, of course, abolished) by the ordinary when they keep the work from being done at all."

What is said in this last paragraph with reference to parish schools will interest also our readers; for our parish schools have a similar problem to face. J. H. C. F.

Degrees and Teaching Ability. — *America* of December 31, 1927, says editorially: —

"One of the higher degrees from a good university means much, no doubt. But are we not making too much of the doctor's degree for teachers and too little of the doctor's ability to teach? *Doctor* originally meant one who knew his subject and was able to teach it to others. To-day, however, many a college fights for the services of a *savant* with both the higher degrees, only to discover that as a teacher he is a total loss. He may *know,* but he cannot *do.*

"Teaching is both an art and a science. Technical courses may provide the aspirant with the necessary science, but no course yet devised equips him with the art. A B. A. who can stimulate and inspire is a far more valuable asset to a university than the dry-as-dust pedant with an armful of sheepskins." J. H. C. F.

The Pope's Temporal Power. — The Pope must demand territorial possessions. That is the claim made by *America* in an editorial, in which it discusses the "ever-recurring Roman question," reaching the following conclusions: "This, then, is the heart of the question. The Holy See must be acknowledged by all the world to be an independent, though spiritual, Power. This, as things go in this world, it will never be as long as it is not at the same time acknowledged to possess true juridical sovereignty. The only means yet found in the present state of the world by which this sovereignty, admitted as such by all the world, may be kept inviolate is by the possession of a free and independent territory. These four principles are the heart of the Holy See's position: spiritual sovereignty, independence from any state, civil sovereignty of some sort as the outward form of this independence, and possession of territory, however small, as the means of maintaining this outward form."

We profess that we cannot follow this line of argumentation; it is a masterpiece of trickery and juggling of terms. If the Holy See is a "spiritual power," it certainly does not require "civil sovereignty of some sort as the outward form of this independence." Such a deduction is ridiculous — the height of absurdity. MUELLER.

The Movies and Religion. — The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* writes editorially: "The movies are making much of the protest entered by the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism against such pictures as 'King of Kings,' 'The Ten Commandments,' and a picture called 'The Atheist,' reported to be in preparation. Mr. Will Hays, writing to the president of the association, says: 'To ask us to eliminate God from motion pictures is equivalent to asking that sunshine be barred from the playgrounds where emaciated, ill-kept children of the tenements find a moment's respite of happiness. It is equivalent to asking us to blot the stars from the heavens because men may look at them and dare ask themselves, as Napoleon did, "But who, gentlemen, made all those?"' Nevertheless, if we were interested in advancing atheism, we should not protest against 'King of Kings.' That picture may not make atheists, but it does not go far toward making believers, either."

We have not seen the film which is now making the rounds through the various cities under the name "King of Kings"; yet we are ready to believe the *Advocate* when it says that it will not make *believers*. The Church would not suffer loss if such films were eliminated; not the movies, but the churches of Christ are commissioned to preach the Gospel of the King of kings. MUELLER.

The Russian Church Recognizes the Soviet Government. — Under the heading "Recent Events" the *Catholic World* reports the following with respect to the relation of the Russian Church to the Soviet Government: "The heroic Archbishop Tikhon is believed to have issued a manifesto during his tragic imprisonment recognizing the legitimacy of the *de facto* government in Russia. It had no effect, however, in allaying the persecution. The present Metropolitan, Serge of Nizhni Novgorod, who was also imprisoned for a time, is now trying to legalize the status of the Orthodox Church. In a pas-

toral letter issued last summer, but only recently made known outside Russia, the archbishop unequivocally recognizes the legitimacy of the Soviet *régime* and announces the complete separation of the Orthodox Church of Tikhon within Russia from that of the *émigrés* outside Russia. It may be expected that many will give up their adherence to the Orthodox Church rather than recognize the Soviet Government, but the pastoral letter must inevitably strengthen that government."

Other reports from Russia clearly prove that this recognition of the Soviet Government is based upon far-reaching concessions made by the Soviets to the Church. MUELLER.

What Does the Layman Know Concerning Evolution? — According to the *American Review of Reviews* the layman is supposed, not to know, but to believe, that man descended from the anthropoids. In his inaugural presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, August 31, 1927, Sir Arthur Keith had declared that Darwin was right, and he unfolded the thesis: "The evidence of man's evolution from an apelike being is definite and irrefutable." The article in the *Review's* October number, commenting on this address, has the heading: "Science Confirms the Darwinian Theory" and concludes with the statement: "One thing that Sir Arthur makes clear is that Darwin's work is still unfinished. There remains many a gap, or at least clouded point, in the story of evolution. But if the layman of 1927 wants to know if it is true that man, under the action of biological forces which can be observed and measured, has been raised from a place amongst anthropoid apes to that which he now occupies; whether, in short, the vast achievements of science in the last half century still justify rejection of the dogma that man appeared on earth by a sudden creation, the answer rests in a single word: yes." So the "science" of evolution has its adepts and its laymen, those who know of these things and those who have to take the word of the adepts for it. Now, while we cheerfully admit that we and the writer of the *Review* article are, in a manner, laymen in the matter of the scientific research carried on in this field, we, for our part, refuse to accept a single statement of science unless it can be demonstrated to our layman mind. Furthermore, the *Review* is trying to befuddle the mind of the layman. It declares that science confirms the Darwinian theory. What the facts entitle it to say is that another noted scientist affirms the Darwinian theory. It aims at creating the impression that scientists are pretty well agreed on this point. It must know (unless the writer of the *Review* article is at the very bottom of the layman class) that a host of scientists reads the results of all this scientific research differently. The layman of 1927 ought to be told what, to mention only one instance, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, of Chicago, an internationally famous physicist, knows of these things. He went on record in an address before the American Chemical Society at Los Angeles, in 1925, as *knowing* nothing. He declared: "The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientists can ever prove." "We must not take

a few facts and then draw conclusions." What has happened since 1925 to bring in "evidence of man's evolution which is definite and irrefutable"? By the way, the *Review* writer cannot deny his status as a veritable layman in science. He speaks of the Darwinian *theory* and winds up with the assertion that the question concerning evolution must be answered with an emphatic yes. The abc class in science knows that a theory refuses to be called a fact. A bad *lapsus* happened to the adept himself. Sir Arthur (and the *Review* layman, of course, as well) is confusing Darwinism, a specific theory of evolution, with evolution. Darwinism has long been dead. — But to get back to our original question, What does the layman know concerning evolution? There are quite a number of laymen who, while incapable of pursuing scientific research, *know* that evolution will never be proved. And they would reject it even if every single scientist of great or little note believed in it, — even if Dr. Millikan and all the rest changed their minds. Luther was one of these laymen. And he said: "You must be so certain of God's Word that even though all men should speak differently, yea, all angels should say *no*, you still could stand upon it and say: 'And yet I know that this Word of God is right.'" (8, 1003.) — By way of postscript: The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism cabled Sir Arthur this greeting: "We hail with joy your uncompromising championship of the ape ancestry of man. Your boldness and plain speaking will encourage atheists the world over." That, of course, was not the purpose of his address. E.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

It is reported that Prof. Carl Stange, D. D., of the University of Goettingen, has been called to succeed Prof. Reinhold Seeberg, D. D., in the theological faculty of the University of Berlin. (N. L. C. B.)

It is announced that the Second Lutheran World Convention will meet in Copenhagen, Denmark, beginning June 21, 1929, and continuing eight or ten days. One session will be held in the old cathedral of Lund, Sweden. Among the things on the program are the quadricentennial of Luther's Catechisms and the anniversary of the Augsburg Confession in 1930.

According to latest census returns from Washington, the Buffalo Synod numbers 41 churches, with a total of 9,267 members. The Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, or Suomi Synod, totals 185 churches, with a membership of 32,071. The United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has 190 churches and 29,198 members.

On New Guinea gold has been found, which means that there is a rush of adventurers to that famous island. The Iowa Synod is carrying on mission-work there, and the missionaries find their efforts greatly hampered by the unscrupulous whites, who care more for money than for morals.

Luther's teaching on the condition of the soul between death and the resurrection of the body is seized upon by unbelievers (for instance, by the *Foolkiller*) to prove that the great Reformer denied the immortality of the soul. What Luther did say repeatedly is that in his opinion the soul is in a state of blissful sleep during the interval between the moment of death and the moment when the archangel's trumpet will sound. To construe this to mean that Luther denied the immortality of the soul is either due to hopeless stupidity or to a malicious intention of deceiving the uninitiated. *Tertium non datur.*

"Pentecostal Assemblies of the World" is the name adopted by an association of Pentecostal churches with headquarters at Indianapolis. A folder setting forth their teachings shows that they believe in immersion, divine healing, Communion as a commemoration of Christ's "broken body and spilled blood," foot-washing, and the Millennium. They oppose going to theaters, moving picture shows, fairs, and picnics. They condemn the use of tobacco and the bearing of arms. Divorce is permitted only in case of adultery. Evidently they have zeal, but it is not altogether according to knowledge.

The almost unbelievable has come to pass — the American *Review of Reviews* admits that Germany was not solely responsible for the war. Says the editor in the issue of January, 1928: "For a while we were in the habit of fixing all the blame upon Germany; but now it is fully realized that there was discredit enough to distribute all over Europe, with plenty to spare."

The exchanges report that the aborigines of New Zealand, the Maoris, are founding a Church which is composed exclusively of people of their own race. This Church, then, will be established along racial lines. The leader, a man by the name of Ratana, is said to place himself on the Scriptures, although what is said about his emphasis on faith-healing and his founding of a city which bears his name does not sound very reassuring.

Mr. Selden was appointed by the editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal* to investigate Christian missions. After spending seven months on that errand, he wrote a book entitled *Are Missions a Failure?* The book was published by Fleming H. Revell Co. When Mr. Selden started out, he took with him, as he says, "a complete outfit of the modern Western man's preconceived notions, prejudices, and skepticisms concerning missions." And he openly confesses that he thought that the missionary enterprise was futile. After his searching investigation, this is what he has to say: "The missionaries are the one group of Western people living in the East who are a credit to the West."

Dr. Cadman, President of the Federal Council of Churches, would like to see all theological controversy outlawed for fifty years, declaring that there is too much theological speculation, and that Modernists have contended for their cause strongly enough and Fundamentalists have written far too much. Dr. Goodchild rejoins very properly: "Instead of a truce I propose a revival of honesty for the next fifty years." Well put! Let Modernists quit using the money of Bible-loving Christians and preaching in the pulpits dedicated to the message of the divine Jesus. How refreshing it would be if strict honesty were practised in this sphere!

BOOK REVIEW.

Proceedings of the Fifty-Fourth Convention of the Central District of the Missouri Synod. 70 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

While the average copy of the printed synodical proceedings has 40 to 60 pages, this copy of the Central District has 112. The Central District reprints the entire German essay on "The Two States of Christ" by Prof. E. Schnedler and a good portion of the English essay on "Civil Government" by the Rev. A. C. Mueller. The District, however, decided at its last meeting to discontinue the general distribution of the printed *Proceedings*. We rather fear that as a result not many members of their churches will purchase a copy.

The minutes of the business meetings contain two long committee re-

ports: on "Conditions upon which Loans are Granted to Congregations" and on a "Form for the Induction of Officers," and two short reports: on "Finances," with reference to the deficits in synodical and District treasuries, and on "The Lodge," all of which reports were adopted. Although the District contributes large sums of money, it was not of the opinion that the financial needs exceeded the financial possibilities of its members and that therefore retrenchment is necessary, but adopted the following resolutions: "The situation demands faithful, energetic, and immediate action. Since the Lord has abundantly blessed, and still is blessing, our labors in the home fields as well as abroad, and since evidently it is the pleasure of the Lord to grant us still greater spiritual victories, we recommend to the Hon. Central District: 1. Earnestly to pray the Lord that He may forgive us our shortcomings in carrying on His work, and that He may by His Word and Spirit make us ever more loyal to His cause, ever more willing to work, and liberal in giving for the support and extension of His kingdom; 2. earnestly to petition each of our congregations and mission-stations to continue in the work of faith and therefore to do its utmost in gathering the funds necessary to cover our present budget; 3. earnestly to request all District officials and laymen's conferences to do everything in their power for the furtherance of this cause and to arrange a visit of each congregation at the earliest opportunity in order that the situation be forcefully brought home to them; 4. to furnish three extra copies of these resolutions to every congregation, one each for the secretary, the delegate, and the pastor." — The lodge resolutions presented by the laymen and adopted by the District read as follows: "The laymen assembled in session June 22, at 8 A. M., and passed the following resolution, which they respectfully submit to Synod for discussion and adoption: Whereas, in the 1925 convention, the District discussed the lodge question fully and passed resolutions concerning it (see p. 74 of *Proceedings* of 1925); and whereas Synod in delegate convention assembled in St. Louis in 1926 passed similar resolutions; and whereas our Church, through its periodicals and otherwise, calls attention to our correct Scriptural stand against the lodge; and whereas all our congregations have had the opportunity to be sufficiently informed on the stand taken by our Church; therefore be it resolved that we strongly urge our pastors and synodical officials to see to it that the resolutions passed be fearlessly carried out, and we assure them of our whole-hearted support and confidently believe we voice the sentiment of the laity of our Church." An unusual number of overtures, seventeen, were submitted to the District.

Synodical Proceedings: *Oregon and Washington District.* 40 pages; 25 cts. — *Texas District.* 63 pages; 40 cts. — *Western District.* 39 pages; 25 cts. — *Northern Nebraska District* (German and English minutes printed in separate editions). 30 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The doctrinal essays printed in these *Proceedings* are the following: Oregon and Washington District: "How Do We, on the Basis of What the Bible Teaches, Train Our Christians to Contribute for Charitable Purposes?" (German), by the Rev. M. C. Kauth; Texas District: "The Seventh Article of the Formula of Concord, 'Of the Sacrament of the Altar'" (German), by the Rev. E. F. Moerbe; Western District: "The

Power of the Gospel in Reference to the Gifts of Christians for the Kingdom of God" (German), by Dr. F. Pieper, and "The Church at Corinth — a Picture of the True Church of To-day" (English), by Prof. J. T. Mueller; Northern Nebraska District: "What a Lutheran Christian Should Know about Synod" (English), by the Rev. J. Holstein and "Our Position towards the Bible" (German), by the Rev. E. Gehrke. The Oregon and Washington District adopted resolutions in reference to a finance committee, and so did the Western, Texas, and Northern Nebraska Districts. Resolutions with reference to lodges were adopted by the Western and Northern Nebraska Districts. The Texas District adopted a number of resolutions regarding publicity. The Western District elected a press committee. The reports on missions take much space in all the printed *Proceedings*, which is a healthy sign; also the Christian education of children by means of the Christian day-school is stressed. FRITZ.

Proceedings of the Southern Nebraska District of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. 1927. 25 cts.

The *Southern Nebraska District Messenger* (*Sued-Nebraska-Distriktsbote*) for December, 1927, contains the official account of the synodical sessions of that District held in 1927. There are submitted two essays pertaining to the First Petition of the Lord's Prayer, one in German, written by Rev. G. Viehweg, on the subject, "Hallowing the Name of God by Keeping Our Doctrine Pure," the other in English, on "Holiness of Living" (essayist, Prof. Hy. Koenig).

Himmlischer Trost fuer Kranke und Angefochtene. By *Carl F. Eissfeldt*. 82 pages, $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{8}$. 60 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The writer of this book says in his preface: "The following meditations, if I may call them so, originated with me while I was doing missionary work in public institutions, especially in the form of brief talks at sick-beds. To many a heart they have brought comfort, light, and peace. This fact has encouraged me to put these meditations in writing during my leisure hours and, upon the wish and advice of my ministerial brethren, to publish them, trusting that I may also in this way, even if it be in a small measure, comply with my Master's request, 'Comfort ye, comfort ye, My people.'" The booklet of 83 pages contains twelve meditations, a number of prayers, hymn-verses, and two forms for sick-communion. We believe that especially young and inexperienced ministers will be glad to purchase a copy of this book and use it. FRITZ.

Beretning om det tiende aarlige Synodemoede af den norske Synode af den Amerikanske Evangelisk Lutherske Kirke. 1927. The Lutheran Synod Book Co., 1101 14th Ave., S. E., Minneapolis, Minn.

We herewith draw the attention of all brethren to this synodical report of the Norwegian Synod, united with us in the Synodical Conference. This synod has an enviable reputation for issuing reports that contain solid and timely reading-matter. The present report measures up to its predecessors. The address of the president (given in Norwegian) is largely historical, showing that the present Norwegian Synod in its doctrine and practise is merely continuing in the course which the old Norwegian Synod pursued

up to the Merger of 1917. The essays treat these subjects: "The Lutheran Church — the True Visible Church of God on Earth"; "The Relation of the Home to the Christian School"; "The Assurance of Faith" (given in Norwegian).

Das Neue Testament mit in den Text eingeschalteter Auslegung, ausfuehrlichen Inhaltsangaben und erlaeuternden Bemerkungen, herausgegeben von *August Daechsel*. Erste Haelfte: Geschichtsbuecher. Erste Abteilung: Die Evangelien St. Matthaei, St. Marci und St. Lucae. $4.00. (A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., Leipzig, Germany.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is the fifth volume of Daechsel's famous commentary on the Bible. It is a stately tome of 888 pages, offering the three synoptic gospels in Luther's text with a very full commentary. The brief explanations, inserted parenthetically in the text, smaller type being used for them, are valuable. Pastors and teachers will be grateful especially for the extended notes, essays or *excursus* one might call them, in which important points are treated. Where pericopes occur, a number of sermon themes with brief subdivisions are submitted. Prominent conservative exegetes are freely quoted. An amazing abundance of historical and archeological lore has been incorporated. The work having originated some sixty years ago, the modern discoveries, for instance, those concerning the census mentioned Luke 2, 1. 2, are naturally not alluded to. One feels now and then that the author indulges in unnecessary prolixity. That the work (while, generally speaking, it is conservatively Lutheran in its theology) is marred by advocacy of Chiliasm must not be overlooked when one uses it.

Excluded Books of the New Testament. Translated by *J. B. Lightfoot, M. R. James, H. B. Swete*, and others. With an introduction by *J. Armitage Robinson*. $3.00. (Harper & Bros., Publishers. New York and London.)

This collection contains in translation the following works: The Book of James, the Gospel of Nicodemus, the Gospel of Peter, the Revelation of Peter, 1 Clement, 2 Clement, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas. The Lutheran reader will be taken aback by the title *Excluded Books of the New Testament*. It is unfortunate that the publishers, in their quest for a striking and sensational title, happened on one so misleading. Dr. J. Armitage Robinson writes in the introduction, which, by the way, is a valuable piece of work: "I do not like the title, *Excluded Books of the New Testament*, and I have been told I am free to criticize it. It suggests to my mind that the books in question were at one time regarded as a part of the collection called the New Testament and were afterwards ejected on various grounds by a council or assembly of divines, which finally settled the canon and imposed it on the catholic, or universal, Church. Nothing of the sort happened." Looking at the collection itself, we must say that some of the books possess but little value, while others are of great importance to us. The apocryphal books, like the Book of James (*Protevangelium*), are simply works of fiction, and they interest us merely because they show what kind of books people in that epoch enjoyed reading. The Epistles of Clement and Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas are works of an altogether different class. They belong to the writings which are the

sources of our knowledge of the postapostolic Church. Whoever wishes to study the history of the Canon and the theology of the early Fathers has to go to these books. While it is very true that there is a great gulf between these writings and those of the New Testament, one will find that a perusal of the Apostolic Fathers is not unprofitable. The names of the translators are a sufficient guarantee that the work was excellently done.

The Ethic of Jesus. By the *Rev. James Stalker, D. D.* 403 pages. (George H. Doran Company, New York.)

St. Paul never wrote an epistle on Christian ethics. He wrote a good deal on Christian ethics, but never independently of justification by faith and the vicarious satisfaction. These doctrines underlie his various treatises on sanctification and good works and give them life and force. One cannot preach or write on ethics exclusively. You may make ethics the subject of your sermon or book, but if you are going to keep justification and the atonement as far in the background as possible, your work will be a failure. Dr. Stalker († 1927), of the United Free Church of Scotland, treats his subject comprehensively and thoroughly and brings out the familiar truths regarding the Christian's duty towards God and his fellowmen in a gripping way. In dealing with any of these subjects, the minister will do well to study Dr. Stalker's treatment of them. Dr. Stalker does more. He points out the source of the Christian virtues: "The way in which He hoped to get men to love one another was by getting them to love their common Father in heaven." And he goes still a step farther. He points out that the love of God springs from the forgiveness of sins: "The origin of the love of man is the copious presence in the heart of love to God, springing from an abiding consciousness of having been forgiven much. Luke 7, 47." But here he stops. He does not, after all, treat the matter *thoroughly*. The real contents of the Gospel are nowhere set forth. Nowhere is it stated that forgiveness of sins was gained for men by the vicarious satisfaction of Christ. The word "atonement" is used but once, when the author, on p. 261, refers to his three "Lectures on the Atonement." The love of God to mankind is not described according to the Gospel. Having quoted the remark of Aristotle: "Love to God does not exist: it is absurd to talk of such a thing; for God is an unknowable being," he proceeds to describe the love of God. "First, the God of Jesus is a God known. . . . Secondly, the God of Jesus is the God of nature. . . . Thirdly, the God of Jesus is the God of history and of Scripture. . . . Fourthly, the God of Jesus was the heavenly Father." But under this last heading not a word is said to the effect that God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. On the contrary: "The latter alternative has been maintained by theologians — that there is no fatherhood of God to any except such as have been reconciled to Him in Christ. But this view seems to be decisively set aside by the parable of the Prodigal Son." The author does not deny the necessity of the redemption. He believes in Jesus the Redeemer, but he has failed to bring out the indissoluble connection between the work of Christ and Christian ethics. One might object that he is treating of ethics exclusively. But, as we have said, no man has any right to do so. If he does, all his fine words on the Christian virtues (of which there are many in this book, to be profitably appropriated by any preacher) will fail to grip the heart. The book is

marred by other serious defects, rather let us say, grave errors. There are traces of Pelagianism. There is kenoticism outright. Then there is the wrong definition of repentance. Repentance, or conversion, "if understood in its full Scriptural sense, is the sum and substance of the Gospel" — which is true; but what is repentance, or conversion? "The first element in repentance is awakening." "A second element is fear." "A third element is a vision of good." "A fourth element is confession." "A fifth element is decision." "In the conversion of Zacchaeus a noteworthy feature is restitution." And the concluding paragraph of this chapter: "Repentance in its purest form is flight from a besetting sin and a lost life and the pursuit of a better life.... It is an upheaval of the nature from its foundations; it is a decisive breach with the past; it is a great venture for the future." Not a word on faith! "Faith is the second step upwards out of unrighteousness towards Christian character," conversion being the first. And what is faith? Not simply the reliance on the Gospel-promise of forgiveness, so far as this book is concerned. In fact, "it cannot be alleged with truth that faith has, in the teaching of Christ, the same simple sense as in the epistles of St. Paul." There is much other dross which the reader must reject while extracting the gems embedded in the presentation of the various Christian, Christlike virtues. The most serious fault, however, is this, that the book, besides neglecting the real Gospel in treating of sanctification, creates the impression that the ethical teaching of Christ is a constitutive element of the Gospel. It so impressed the publishers: "As an exposition of the whole Gospel in its many aspects this book has not been surpassed." The *Western Christian Advocate* gets the same impression: "At an hour like this, when the world is seeking the truth of the teaching of Christ, this volume is of inestimable value." E.

Peter, Prince of Apostles. A Study in the History and Tradition of Christianity. By *F. J. Foakes-Jackson*, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. $2.50. (George H. Doran Co., New York.)

In this book Prof. Foakes-Jackson, known as a church historian, has given the public an important work. The superscriptions of the 21 chapters will indicate this at once: 1. Galilee and Its Lake. 2. The Preaching of the Baptist. 3. The Call of Peter. 4. Peter's Training by Jesus. 5. The Christ and the Promise to Peter. 6. Peter and the Beginnings of the Church. 7. Peter, the Twelve, and James. 8. Peter and Paul. 9. The Canonical Epistles of Peter. 10. Peter in the New Testament. 11. Simon Peter and Mark. 12. Did Peter Visit Rome? 13. Peter in the Clementine Literature. 14. The Apocryphal Acts-Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter. 15. The Beginnings of the Church in Rome. 16. The First Bishops of Rome. 17. The Spirit of Peter in Rome. 18. Peter in England. 19. Peter in the Christian World. 20. Peter in Jewish Legends. 21. The Resting-place of Peter. The five appendices treat of the Sea of Galilee, early Roman Christianity, martyrdom in Rome, feasts of St. Peter, and list of pictures of St. Peter. Here, then, we have an exhaustive book on the great apostle, who next to Paul is the foremost figure among the followers of Christ in the first century. Prof. Foakes-Jackson, in his theology, exhibits the modern critical views, the chief article of which is a denial of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. But apart from its negative higher criticism

and naturalistic theology the book is a valuable production. The chapter treating of the question whether Peter visited Rome discusses all the available material dispassionately and arrives at the conclusion that the evidence we have is not entirely conclusive. "The probability that St. Peter was an organizer of the Roman Christian community is very strong indeed, though the evidence for this cannot in honesty be pronounced to be unquestionable." Of the beginnings of the church in Rome he writes: "That Peter visited Rome after he had escaped from Herod Agrippa's prison is perfectly possible, yet there is no evidence to show he did." The history of the Roman Church in its early stages is traced as far as the scanty material at our disposal makes this possible. Those who wish to acquaint themselves with the apocryphal writings that were current under the name of Peter can do so by means of this volume, which undoubtedly will soon be widely circulated.

A Philosophy from Prison. A Study in the Epistle to the Ephesians by *F. A. Barry*, Professor in Kings College, London. $1.25. (Geo. H. Doran Co., New York.)

The author believes, although somewhat faint-heartedly, that Paul is the author of Ephesians and that the epistle was written while the apostle was a prisoner in Rome, between 60 and 62. He thinks that it was a circular letter, addressed not only to the congregation in Ephesus, but to the congregations in the neighborhood of that city as well. The book was written for the English youth studying in high schools and colleges. Perhaps the most valuable chapter is the one entitled: "God in History," in which religious conditions at the time when Paul wrote are described. The nascent Gnosticism which Paul combats especially in Colossians is sketched on p. 29 ff. The work is not intended as a commentary on Ephesians, but may rather be called a discussion of some of the great ideas contained in this letter so dear to all Bible readers. When the author speaks of the central position of Christ in the universe and of the establishment of the Church in which the old barrier between Jew and Gentile is broken down, he is aiding us in understanding the epistle. Many points he misses. Thus the magnificent treatment of the doctrine of election in chapter 1 has apparently remained a sealed book to him. Generally speaking, he is a Modernist, although not of the extreme type, since he still believes in the incarnation and hence in the deity of Christ. The difference between the theology of the author and our own appears quite clearly in his argumentation. While we wish to be guided by Scripture, he proceeds from general principles, which he usually endeavors to identify with those of Paul, and from these he deduces his views. His method, then, is not Scriptural, but philosophical. Our criticism is well expressed in the old *dictum: Quod non est biblicum, non est theologicum.* Now and then the author does justice to the thought of the epistle; for instance, in his comments on chap. 2, 1—11, he reveals a better understanding of Pauline doctrine than many would-be orthodox theologians. We shall quote a few striking sentences (p. 75): "What is happening in the lives of Christians is not the result of their own self-improvement nor merited by their good behavior. It is the act of God's condescension, offering them the Free Gift (grace) of redemption. It is not that man first becomes better and then God receives him to Himself. The whole point of Christianity is the opposite.

'While yet dead in trespasses and sins' and long before they are 'fit to be forgiven,' men are offered God's revelation and the gift which 'quickens together with Christ.' (Contrast our current moral standard: 'I am ready to forgive him when he shows he is fit to be forgiven.' Cf. Rom. 5, 6—9.) It is not of ourselves, but the gift of God. It is not of works, *i. e.*, no one can say (and especially, he means, no Jew), 'I have earned this privileged position by the integrity of my life and conduct.' "

Familiar Failures. By *Rev. Clovis G. Chappell, D. D.*, Pastor of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, South Memphis, Tenn. 164 pages, 5×7⅝. $1.60. (George H. Doran Company, New York.)

This is a book of sermons. These sermons make very interesting reading. But while telling the Christian *what* to do, they fail in directing him to the *source* and *power of the new life;* in other words, the preacher moralizes, but fails to stress, at least sufficiently so, repentance and faith in Jesus as the prerequisite and the impelling power of a holy life.

FRITZ.

The Mosaic Law in the Light of Modern Science. By *Thomas H. Nelson.* 190 pages. (The John C. Winston Co.)

It is not a pleasant duty to criticize a volume which is written to emphasize the credibility of any part of the Scriptures; and yet any apologetic work, in order to be of as much value as apologetic efforts can be, must, first of all, be entirely Scriptural and must then be in strict accord with the corroborative facts which it adduces. We believe that the present volume does not meet these requirements. In the first place, the author directly states: "There never was such a thing in the Bible as a mere Ceremonial Law"; and he holds that the Mosaic ordinances, often the peculiarly ecclesiastical and ritualistic considerations, are still operative and decisive for the Christian. This leads him to insist on the observance of the seventh day, the superiority of "kosher meat," the alleged infectious character of pork, the tabu of the unclean animals mentioned in the "holiness laws," and similar parallel statements. On the other hand, the statements which he advances as scientific, especially in regard to the origin of the world, are sometimes quite stretched and of questionable scientific authority. He has the usual incorrect notion of the creation day and of the compatibility of the Genesis record of creation with the geologic conception of the creation of the world in six periods, a position which he describes as scientific, but which is, as far as we know, not seriously advocated by any recognized present-day geologists. We do not wish to intimate that our pastors will not find some stimulating thoughts in these pages, but, in addition to what has been said, we feel that there are other points which might have been stressed much more fully and that some of the allegorical or symbolical interpretations should be dropped. W. A. M.

Concordia Calendar, 1928. 50 cts. (Concordia Mutual Benefit League, Lutheran Bldg., 105—109 N. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This almanac contains a very large amount of interesting and edifying reading-matter. The article by our esteemed colleague Prof. J. T. Mueller on "Christian Missions" deserves special mention.